

## REMARKS

In the Office Action dated October 9, 2003, the Examiner rejected claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as anticipated by Wohlmacher ("Digital Certificates: a Survey of Revocation Models").

By this amendment Applicant has amended claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 16-21, 23, 25, 28, and 29. In view of these amendments and the remarks that follow, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a).

Wohlmacher describes the Online Certificate Status Protocol (OCSP) for determining the status of certificates online. According to Wohlmacher, the OCSP includes a client that sends an OCSP request to an OCSP responder that identifies one or more certificates. Based on the request, the OCSP responder generates an OCSP response that includes a timestamp of when the request was generated, identifiers and status values of the certificates included in the request. The status value provided by the OCSP responder may be either set to "good" (meaning the certificate is not revoked, not issued, or the time at which the response was generated was not with the validity of the certificate), "revoked" (meaning revocation of the certificate), and "unknown" (meaning the OCSP responder does not have any information regarding the requested certificate). See Wohlmacher, pages 113-114, Section 7.

In contrast, amended claim 1 recites a method for validating digital certificates in a data processing system having a server, an OCSP responder, a certificate authority, and a certificate database including records associated with digital certificates. The method includes, among other things, receiving, at the OCSP responder, a database query result indicating whether the digital certificate matches a corresponding certificate

entry stored in one of the certificate database records, determining, by the OCSF responder, the validity of the digital certificate based on the database query result and notifying the server of the determined validity of the digital certificate.

Wohlmacher does not teach a data processing system having a server, an OCSF responder, a certificate authority, and a certificate database including records associated with digital certificates that interact in the manner recited by claim 1. For instance, the OCSF responder disclosed by Wohlmacher, does not determine the validity of a digital certificate based on a database query result indicating whether the digital certificate matches a corresponding certificate entry stored in one of a plurality certificate database records. Claim 1, on the other hand, recites a process that includes a combination of steps that allow an OCSF responder to determine the validity of a certificate using an indication reflecting a match of certificate information in a database. Wohlmacher does not mention a database that provides these types of indications, much less a OCSF responder that notifies a server of the determined validity of digital certificate based on the indication received from the database.

Because Wohlmacher fails to teach each and every recitation of claim 1, Applicant requests that the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1. As explained, claim 1 is distinguishable from Wohlmacher. Accordingly, claims 2-4 are also distinguishable from this references for at least the same reasons set forth in connection with claim 1. Because Wohlmacher fails to teach each and every recitation of claims 2-4, Applicant requests that the

FINNEGAN  
HENDERSON  
FARABOW  
GARRETT &  
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
202.408.4000  
Fax 202.408.4400  
www.finnegan.com

rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 5, 7, 9, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 21, 23, 25, 28, and 29 include recitations similar (albeit not identical) to those of claim 1. As explained, claim 1 is distinguishable from Wohlmacher. Accordingly, claims 5, 7, 9, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 21, 23, 25, 28, and 29 are also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reasons set forth in connection with claim 1.

For example, Wohlmacher does not teach a method performed by a directory server that includes, among other things, returning an indication of the database record when the database record reflecting the requested digital certificate is found to indicate validity of the requested digital certificate, whereby the indication of the database record includes meta-data reflecting the validity of the requested digital certificate, as recited in claim 5. Although, Wohlmacher describes an OCSP responder that creates an OCSP response, the information included in the response is not based on an indication from a directory server that includes validity meta-data.

Further, Wohlmacher fails to teach a processor configured to search a database for a database record reflecting an identity of the requested digital certificate; and return an indication of the database record to the first computer when the database record reflecting the requested digital certificate is found to indicate validity of the requested digital certificate, as recited in claim 14. Nowhere does Wohlmacher mention a database that searches records and provides indication in the manner recited in claim 14.

FINNEGAN  
HENDERSON  
FARABOW  
GARRETT &  
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
202.408.4000  
Fax 202.408.4400  
www.finnegan.com

Claims 6, 8, 10 and 11, 15, 18-20, 22, 24, and 26 and 27 depend from claims 5, 7, 9, 14, 17, 21, 23, and 25, respectively. As explained, these claims are distinguishable from Wohlmacher. Accordingly, claims 6, 8, 10 and 11, 15, 18-20, 22, 24, 26, and 27 are also distinguishable from the reference for at least the same reasons in connection with claims 5, 7, 9, 14, 17, 21, 23, and 25, and Applicant requests that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) be withdrawn and the claims timely allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: January 8, 2004

By: 

Joseph E. Palys  
Reg. No. 46,508

FINNEGAN  
HENDERSON  
FARABOW  
GARRETT &  
DUNNER <sup>LLP</sup>

1300 I Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
202.408.4000  
Fax 202.408.4400  
www.finnegan.com